

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-2 remain in this application. New claim 3 is added without adding any new matter.

The Examiner rejected the claims for nonstatutory, obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,686,671. Applicant will file a terminal disclaimer when the claims are otherwise allowable.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Simon *et al.* (U.S. 5,629,694). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a key switch including a plurality of key contacts and “equipped with one of said plural key contacts as a power supply control key contact of said power supply control key” with a key scan circuit for “detecting open/close states of said plural key contacts of said key switch including said *power supply control key contact*” (emphasis added) and power supply control key state detecting means for “detecting an open/close state of *said power supply control key contact* independent from the open/close state detection by said key scan circuit” (emphasis added). The cited reference does not teach such a device.

In particular, the Examiner should note that the claims recite that the same “power supply control key contact” is used *both* by the key scan circuit *and* by the power supply control key state detecting means. In contrast, Simon clearly teaches that its space bar key uses *two separate contacts* that are jointly activated by the space key (keyswitch 62SB and additional contact set 26; see Fig. 3 and col. 7, lines 34-37). Furthermore, the Simon specification clearly teaches that the keyswitch 62SB and additional contact set 26 are part of separate circuits (see col. 7 lines 37-45). Thus, the claim language does not read on the device of the Simon reference because there is no *single* contact performing

both functions, as specifically required by the claim language (see also Fig. 1, sw11 of the specification, for an example embodiment).

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the reference. Claims 2 and 3, which depend on claim 1, are thus patentable over the reference for the same reasons as claim 1.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32988US1.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East Ninth Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 27, 2006